

## **RECOMMENDATIONS, QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ANNUAL UPDATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012/13 FOR EXPANSION/PRUDENT RESERVE**

The Commission for Children and Families has been an active participant in the County stakeholder process for both the Community Service and Support (CSS) planning and the Prevention and Early Intervention (PEI) planning for this voter approved effort to increase mental health services in the community. We have provided representation on the Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) Stakeholder's Systems Leadership Team (SLT) since its inception. In addition, the Commission established a Mental Health Workgroup about a year and a half ago to review the MHSA spending and programs. It is with this background and the needs of children and families that the Commission reviewed the recent plans for prudent reserve and expansion in the MHSA Annual Update for Fiscal Year 2012/13. In reviewing the DMH proposal, the Commission has the following questions, concerns, and recommendations regarding the plan:

### **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ALTERNATE PLAN**

1. The attached proposal includes suggested funding from expansion dollars for:
  - a. Psychiatric Social Workers (PSWs) in the delinquency courts; and
  - b. Funding PSWs as part of MDTs in the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) regional offices to identify youth prior to their "crossing over" to delinquency.

The report from the Conrad N. Hilton Foundation (fact sheet attached) on crossover youth points out the impact these youth have on **all** County funds and services even into their adulthood. Investing in services that would prevent youth from "crossing over" to delinquency would not only benefit the individual youth but also generate a net cost savings to benefit the County.

The research conducted by the Conrad N. Hilton Foundation in partnership with the Los Angeles County Chief Executive Office (CEO) makes a compelling case that some of the children and TAY expansion dollars be spent on this "crossover" population.

The cost for both programs is approximately \$2.2 million. These funds could be made available by shifting funds or eliminating programs from the current MHSA expansion proposal.

## **QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS**

1. The Commission would like to suggest that a more inclusive MHSA planning process be developed. Since some of the services are directly for use in the foster care delinquency system, it would seem appropriate that input be solicited from the Children's Deputies, Justice Deputies, DCFS, Probation, or the Commission for Children and Families, prior to the development of the Plan. While the Commission recognizes the MHSA dollars are intended for all children in Los Angeles County, not just foster and probation children and TAY, the plan would benefit from the knowledge brought forward by the Deputies, Department Representatives, and the Commission who are knowledgeable on a variety of children's issues.

While it appears that most of the services earmarked for expansion come from the original CSS Stakeholder Plans, the largest category of expansion dollars is for Field Capable Clinical Services (FCCS) which was not part of the original TAY or children's plans. This seems to confirm that services can be added that were not part of the original stakeholder process.

2. There are \$6 million allocated to Cross Cutting in the proposed expansion dollars. What will be the percentage and dollar amount deducted from the Prudent Reserve for each age group for the Cross Cutting?
3.
  - a. The attached report from the Department of Mental Health (DMH) dated February 2, 2012 shows estimated unspent dollars for children under the CSS Plan of \$11,009,174 and \$6,249,892 for TAY. Since the Commission understands that DMH considers that unspent dollars are "one-time money" and cannot be spent on expansion services, how will these funds be spent?
  - b. The same February 2, 2012 report shows prudent reserves of \$19,898,182 for TAY funding. Does that mean after the expansion dollars of approximately \$2.1 million for each are taken out the balances will be approximately \$17.8 million and \$17.7 million, respectively?
4. The original CSS Plan included funding for Systems Navigators and Housing Representatives as part of the Transition Resource Centers (TRC). For a number of reasons the TRCs, while initially considered a success, have had a decline in the number of youth "dropping" into these centers. The Chief Executive Office Self Sufficiency Committee is currently assessing the TRCs as part of a larger Youth Development Services (YDS) Redesign. The TRCs may be eliminated or a new model developed. Is this the best time to expand Drop-in Centers? Should that decision be made after the Committee Assessment is complete?

5. While we are in agreement that we do not want TAY sleeping in the street, there were two SLT members who had objections to the emergency shelter bed expansion. It would be helpful to know why? The addition of 3,529 emergency shelter beds suggests a “big picture” problem. Perhaps we need to have an analysis of the problem and determine whether other actions need to be taken instead of just expanding emergency beds.
6. There is a substantial amount of funding being spent on Mental Health Services in the Probation camps. Has there been an analysis of the outcome study as to whether the current services are working? What is the total number of services needed? What are the types of services needed? Has there been an assessment of whether Full Service Partnership (FSP) is the best approach for services in camps?
7. The expansion plan funds that will support a Department of Children and Family Services/Probation – Systems Navigators. The Commission needs clarification on this item. The Commission is concerned regarding the effectiveness of the Systems Navigators in the camps and whether additional navigators are needed. It seems some analysis needs to be done on the effectiveness of the current eight System Navigators. Concerns have been raised from staff in the camps that the Systems Navigators in the camps merely refer the youth to the Systems Navigators in the community. In addition DMH indicated that the justification for adding a TAY Navigator is that a TAY Navigator was moved to the Relative Care Resource Center. However the center only has a Navigator one-half day, one day per week. That Navigator provides services to adult relatives, older adult relatives, children and TAY. Why would the TAY budget absorb the cost of a fulltime Navigator for a position that is only available half-day a week to assist all age groups? Should the funding for this position come from the Cross Cutting category?

The Commission acknowledges the efforts of DMH in dealing with the complex process of implementing and tracking of the MHSA funds and services.

To assist in the process, the Commission continually strives to bring together the diverse perspectives from all County departments to yield an integrated and comprehensive plan to improve the lives of at-risk children, youth and families in Los Angeles County.

**Proposal for Children and Transitional Age Youth (TAY)  
2012/13 Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) Expansion of Prudent Reserve Funds**

**BACKGROUND**

For over a decade the Departments of Children and Family Services (DCFS), Probation, and Mental Health (DMH) have worked in partnership with the Commission for Children and Families, the Superior Court, California State University, Los Angeles, Casey Family Programs, and Georgetown University to address the needs of youth when they “crossover” from the child welfare system to the delinquency system or require dual supervision.

Key strategies that have been implemented through these efforts are:

1. Providing these children with the most effective services;
2. Using Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT) meetings to develop and implement case plans;
3. Using Dependency and delinquency systems to jointly serve and supervise crossover youth.

At the beginning of 2012, Presiding Judge Michael Nash, Los Angeles Juvenile Court, ordered the countywide expansion of MDTs. Psychiatric Social Workers (PSW) are key participants in the multi-disciplinary teams as they provide in-person evaluations (when approved by the children’s attorneys) and written reports to the MDT. The MDT is responsible for preparing joint assessments and creating an appropriate case plan.

Currently DMH is funding one PSW and DCFS is funding five PSWs using Title IV-E Waiver dollars. To cover all 11 delinquency courts would require an additional six PSWs at an additional cost of approximately \$670,800.

**PREVENTING CROSSOVER**

In November 2011, the Conrad N. Hilton Foundation, working with the Los Angeles County Chief Administrative Office, issued a report titled, “Young Adult Outcomes of Youth Exiting Dependent or Delinquent Care in Los Angeles County.” It is the first study to report on outcomes among the sub-group of “crossover” youth who are involved in both child welfare and juvenile justice systems. A fact sheet of the report’s key findings is attached.

In the summary of findings the researchers note, “. . . *membership in the crossover group is a strong and consistent predictor of less desirable outcomes.*” Additionally, they also note, “*Given the relative vulnerability of crossover youth as they enter into adulthood, as well as the comparative costs of providing them with needed services, policymakers might consider taking steps to identify this youth as early as possible so as to provide them with targeted services and supports that would improve their chances of making a successful transition to adulthood and life beyond the child welfare and juvenile justice systems. Insofar as improved outcomes for crossover youth would render them less costly for the county as adults, providing them with proactive targeted attention and services would represent a strategic investment in long-term cost avoidance.*”

The Commission Crossover Committee working with representatives from DCFS and Probation have discussed the advantages of early intervention to prevent crossover. Employing the current model used by the courts, wherein MDTs use a screening tool to identify those youth at high risk of delinquency, would be an ideal solution. The youth would then be linked with services to prevent them from crossing over. This approach seems to be consistent with the researchers’ recommendations. To have a PSW in each DCFS regional office (18), to work with MDT teams would require an additional 13 PSWs at a cost of approximately \$1.453 million. These cost estimates assume existing DMH supervisors in each office would provide supervision. Having a PSW at each DCFS regional office would enable the MDTs to screen youth and link those determined at high risk of delinquent behavior to services to prevent them from crossing over. The current expansion of Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) dollars for children and Transitional Age Youth (TAY) would provide an opportunity to fund the PSWs needed to

1. Complete the countywide expansion of the MDTs; and
2. Allow a new prevention program to be implemented that would begin providing the youth with the intensive services needed to facilitate better outcomes and generate net cost savings to the County. The total cost of both programs would be approximately \$2.1 million.

## Young Adult Outcomes of Youth Exiting Dependent or Delinquent Care in Los Angeles County

### BACKGROUND

Increasing attention is being given to helping vulnerable youth transition successfully into adulthood and independence. Previous research has shown higher risks of criminal justice involvement, unemployment, teen pregnancy, behavioral health disorders, homelessness, and lower educational attainment for youth in child welfare systems. This study investigates the young adult outcomes of youth who age out of, or otherwise exit, Los Angeles County's foster care system and/or juvenile probation system. Investigators analyzed a comprehensive data set of youth who exited foster care or probation in Los Angeles County in 2002 or 2004 linked to records of service utilization that stretched from 2005 to 2009 across seven Los Angeles County Departments and two California state agencies. This unique study looks at the relationship and dynamics between a number of domains including education, employment, health, mental health, criminal justice, and public welfare systems; and it is the first study to report on adult outcomes among the sub-group of "crossover" youth who are involved in both child welfare and juvenile justice systems.

### KEY FINDINGS

1. Young adults who were previously in the child welfare or juvenile justice system, or both (crossover youth), tend to be economically insecure.
  - Sixty-eight percent of youth who exited foster care and 82 percent of crossover youth received public welfare benefits (General Relief, CalWorks, food stamps or MediCal) during the first four years of adulthood. These rates decline in years five to eight but are still substantial (41 percent for foster youth, 54 percent for crossover youth).
  - Less than half of former foster youth and crossover youth had any earnings in early adulthood. The average cumulative earnings over the first four years after exit was less than \$30,000 for former foster youth and less than \$14,000 for crossover youth.
  - One-third of former foster youth and one-half of crossover youth experienced a period of extreme poverty during their young adult years (measured by receiving both CalWorks and General Relief).
2. "Crossover" youth (those who were in both the child welfare and probation systems) experience unique challenges.
  - Crossover youth were more likely than foster youth with no probation involvement to have multiple out-of-home placements and to exit care from a group home (rather than with relatives or a foster family).
  - In comparison to foster youth with no involvement in probation, crossover youth were more than twice as likely to be heavy users of public systems in adulthood, three times as likely to experience a jail stay, one and a half times more likely to receive General Relief, and 50 percent less likely to be consistently employed.
  - Nearly one-quarter of crossover youth received treatment for a serious mental illness during the first four years of adulthood, more than double the rates of those who were in just foster care or probation.
  - The average per-person cost of public service utilization for crossover youth for years one to four (\$35,171) was more than double that of youth in just the foster youth (\$12,532) or probation (\$15,985) systems.

3. Criminal justice involvement as young adults is quite high among these youth and represents significant costs.
  - Nearly two-thirds of crossover youth had a jail stay in early adulthood, compared to half of those who were just on juvenile probation and a quarter of former foster youth.
  - The average cumulative cost of jail stays over four years in young adulthood ranged from \$18,430 (child welfare youth) to \$33,946 (crossover youth).
  - Criminal justice costs accounted for the largest share of average public costs in adulthood, 70 percent for those who were just on probation, 60 percent for crossover youth, and 40 percent for former foster youth.
4. A relatively small number of these youth account for significant public costs as young adults.
  - In each study group, the 25 percent of those who made the most extensive and expensive use of public services accounted for about 75 percent of the overall cost of services.
5. Higher educational attainment and consistent employment are key predictors of positive young adult outcomes.
  - Just under half of former foster youth and crossover youth enrolled in community college in young adulthood; but just about two percent completed an Associate's Degree.
  - Youth who had a pattern of consistent earnings had public service costs 70 percent lower than those who did not have consistent earnings.
  - There was a strong association between level of educational attainment and higher likelihood of employment and earnings, as well as lower levels of public service utilization and costs, jail stays, and public cash assistance.

---

## IMPLICATIONS

- The extension of foster youth benefits through AB12 (or the extension of emancipation in other states) offers an opportunity to provide needed transition services to improve young adult outcomes of vulnerable youth.
- Special attention should be placed on crossover youth and other heavy service users, who experience the most negative personal outcomes and highest levels of public service costs.
- Education and employment services provide key opportunities for intervention to ensure more positive outcomes for vulnerable youth.
- Further research is needed to better understand the role of several factors, including the role of transitional housing programs and the time and circumstances of exits from the child welfare system.

**RESEARCH TEAM**

Dennis Culhane, Professor of Social Policy and Practice, University of Pennsylvania  
Stephen Metraux, Associate Professor of Health Policy and Public Health, University of the Sciences in Philadelphia  
Thomas Byrne, Researcher in Social Policy and Practice, University of Pennsylvania  
Manuel Moreno, Los Angeles County Chief Executive Office  
Halil Toros, Los Angeles County Chief Executive Office

---

**DATA & METHODS**

The data set analyzed for this report came from administrative records maintained by the California Department of Social Services (DSS), the Los Angeles County Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS), and the Los Angeles County Department of Probation. Records of persons previously in the child welfare and/or juvenile justice systems as youth were identified and matched with records from an array of adult systems.

Descriptive analyses examined outcomes occurring in the first four years following exit for those who exited from care in 2004 and outcomes for years five through eight following exit for those who exited in 2002. Multivariate modeling techniques were used to examine whether the differences between groups were attributable to differences in the characteristics, experiences, or other underlying factors associated with membership in each group.

---

**FULL REPORT**

The Executive Summary and Full Report can be downloaded at:  
**<http://www.hiltonfoundation.org/youthexiting>**.

---

**CONRAD N. HILTON  
FOUNDATION**

The Conrad N. Hilton Foundation was created in 1944 by international business pioneer Conrad N. Hilton, who founded Hilton Hotels and left his fortune to help the world's disadvantaged and vulnerable people. The Foundation currently conducts strategic initiatives in five priority areas: providing safe water, ending chronic homelessness, preventing substance abuse, caring for vulnerable children, and extending Conrad Hilton's support for the work of Catholic Sisters. Following selection by an independent international jury, the Foundation annually awards the \$1.5 million Conrad N. Hilton Humanitarian Prize to a nonprofit organization doing extraordinary work to reduce human suffering. From its inception, the Foundation has awarded nearly \$940 million in grants, distributing more than \$100 million in 2010. The Foundation's current assets are approximately \$2 billion. For more information, please visit [www.hiltonfoundation.org](http://www.hiltonfoundation.org).



**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH  
MHSA ANNUAL UPDATE FISCAL YEAR 2012-13**

**Section I: Prudent Reserve**

Utilization of the Prudent Reserve (PR) will make up for the Community Services and Supports (CSS) shortfall for Fiscal Year 2011-12. Funding will address urgent needs associated with CSS elements and initial commitments with 30 million dollars to be used over fiscal years 2012-13 and 2013-14. This will be the last year for several fiscal years counties will be able to withdraw funds from the PR. Funds will be taken out of the PR according to how they were put in, relative to age group allocation.

**Section II: Use of the Prudent Reserve**

Age Group	Program	Expansion Dollar Amount	Expansion Plan, including approximate additional clients to be served
Child	Field Capable Clinical Services (FCCS)	\$2,039,954	627 new clients will be served
	N/A	\$109,880	This money will support the infrastructure for Children's System of Care (social worker and clerical staff)
Transitional Age Youth (TAY)	FSP	\$800,000	30 more FSP slots will be added and designated as directly operated probation camp slots; an additional 8 slots for contractor Step-Up on Second in Service Area 5
	Emergency Shelter Bed	\$300,000	An additional 3,529 shelter bed nights per fiscal year
	Drop-In Center	\$250,000	Funding will support an additional TAY Drop-In Center and will provide access to 250 TAY, year-round (including weekends and after hours)
	FCCS	\$250,000	The dollars will be used primarily for probation camp youth returning to Service Area 6, 60 unique clients will be served.
	N/A	\$410,000	This money will support the infrastructure for TAY System of Care
	TAY Navigator	\$100,000	The funds will support a Department of Children & Family Service – Probation Navigator

**EXHIBIT F**

Age Group	Program	Expansion Dollar Amount	Expansion Plan
Adult	FCCS	\$189,000	94 new clients will be served
	Wellness Center	\$1,861,000	1,255 new clients will be served
Older Adult	FSP	\$587,000	Approximately 66 slots will be added
	FCCS	\$549,075	Approximately 100 new clients will be served
	Wellness Center		Approximately 300 existing older adult clients being currently served in Wellness Centers will receive specialized assessment (MMSE), WRAP for older adults, psychosocial groups focused on older adult issues and case management to access specialized housing options, healthcare and Medicare benefits.
Cross Cutting	Alternative Crisis Services (Urgent Care Centers, IMD Step Down Services)	\$6,000,000	Approximately 11,000 additional clients would be served in Urgent Care Centers and an additional 126 additional clients served in IMD Step-down programs per year.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES - DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH  
MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ACT  
SUMMARY OF APPROVED ALLOCATION, PRUDENT RESERVE & UNSPENT DOLLARS

Age Group	Stakeholders Approved Allocation CSS (FY 06-06), PEI (FY 07-08)		Total Prudent Reserve (FYs 07-08; 08-09)		Estimated Unspent Dollars As Of FY 10-11	
	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%
<b>A. CSS</b>						
CHILDREN	\$ 5,423,084	14.49%	\$ 19,916,331	15.61%	\$ 11,009,174	57.21%
TAY	5,121,802	13.69%	19,895,182	15.59%	6,249,892	32.48%
ADULT	16,269,255	43.48%	62,810,747	49.23%	(40,128,493) <sup>(1)</sup>	-208.52%
OLDER ADULT	3,314,108	8.86%	10,882,280	8.53%	2,007,673	10.43%
CROSS CUTTING	7,285,416	19.47%	14,071,211	11.03%	40,108,479 <sup>(1)</sup>	208.40%
<b>TOTAL CSS</b>	<b>\$ 37,413,665</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$ 127,577,751</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$ 19,244,725</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>B. PEI</b>						
CHILDREN	\$ 11,318,278	33.29%	\$ 11,318,278	34.15%	\$ 47,736,148	28.77%
TAY	7,678,531	22.58%	7,678,531	23.16%	46,405,866	27.97%
ADULT	5,225,657	15.37%	5,225,657	15.78%	17,634,836	10.63%
OLDER ADULT	5,105,683	15.02%	5,105,683	15.40%	31,798,300	19.16%
ADMINISTRATION	4,673,651	13.75%	3,819,503	11.52%	22,355,602	13.47%
<b>TOTAL PEI</b>	<b>\$ 34,001,800</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$ 33,147,652</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$ 165,930,752</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<sup>(1)</sup> Reflects the realignment of program services for Adult and Cross Cutting. Cross Cutting includes Planning, Outreach and Engagement and Administration. The funding in Cross Cutting associated with the Service Area Navigators is reflected in the funding for the respective age groups.